



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/737,389

12/16/2003

En-Yi Liao

10033.000400

5362

31894 7590 04/16/2008
OKAMOTO & BENEDICTO, LLP
P.O. BOX 641330
SAN JOSE, CA 95164

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/737,389 | Applicant(s) LIAO, EN-YI | |
| | Examiner RANODHI N. SERRAO | Art Unit 2141 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) RANODHI N. SERRAO. (3) Patrick Benedicto (Reg. No. 40,909).
 (2) Kenneth Coulter. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 07 April 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 10-15, 22 and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: Schneider (2004/0158741).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed how the prior art of record fails to teach the invention as claimed. With the primary's approval, the examiner proposed incorporating the limitations of claims 12 and 15 into claim 1 and incorporating the limitations of claim 23 into claim 22 in order to further advance prosecution of the application. The applicant agreed. All amendments and remarks will be finally considered at the time of filing.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/RANODHI N SERRAO/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2141

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required